Dear Js, 6/7/74

The day of work here is always broken up, as before breakfast, the early start, and then to a succession of interruptions which make it difficult to keep a single thing in mind. Yesterday the afternoon was taken up with a long and rather successful session with Bud and Jim on what we do about the coming evidentiary hearing, beginning with motions and a pre-trial conference on the 21st; what we do or do not do about the Livingston insanity which is that even if it is founded on something (and one way or another is) and how; Ray; anticipating counter-moves; even other matters not Ray-connected. By the time they left it was supper time, then I had hand-mowing of grass until dark, and by then what I had been working on was too much out of mind to resume before bed.

Fortunately, I had concluded a chapter before they got here.

There are also multitudinous other problems, some of which are not unknown to you.

It all adds up to a difficult time concentrating on The Unimpeachment and even assessing it.

Because this is a breaking story, perhaps unwisely I decided against a prepared outline in favor of flexibility and aware that it might mean extensive reorganizing and perhaps discarding. In this direction, I have as one purpose not having to make any significant additions when I have the draft completed. To date I have anticipated what could happen and did and have no rewriting on that score.

Again perhaps unwisely I am working with a frame rather than an outline in mind and writing in the expectation that as I write I will come to understand as I could not in trying to outline whether what I have in mind is viable and is put together right and says what I want it to say. So far I think so good, but not having read a word of it this may be hope rather than fact.

I decided that all that made it possible for Nixon to avoid impeachment at the outset and then during the Ervin and other hearings simply can't be told in any credible way without an extraordinarily long and complicated book that would have too many liabilities.

As an alternative I decided to take some to me key elements and concentrate on them. Except that if nothing new comes out on taxes I may work what I have that has not been used in where it seems to fit, what this works out to so far and I think will in the end is the untold story of the direct and indirect CIA involvement, the covering of it separately from and together with that of Nixon, the conflict between the two (which I've not yet reached), the overlap into domestic activities and the untold Mullen story, centering this on what is untold and what was avoided and what was not put together on and about Hunt.

Obviously it is impossible to go into all of this limited concept. One of the things I have omitted, a $20,000 grant to the Stanford Research Institute in 1964 by the Littauer foundation, may interest you.

In the course of this, where it seems more than just appropriate and less than would be justified, I'll be pointing out whitewashing, including by old Wobblybrow. (Who voted <u>against</u> strengthening the FOI law the other day. If that debate interests you, it is in the Congressional Record of 5/30. I'll probably make a copy of the EMK remarks when I read it. More extensive than Jim first told me. He encapsulated, accurately. My Senator and Cranston are co-sponsors of the amendment. But I think the EMK remarks can be a beginning if the buts will leave him alone.) I am working in an accasional comment on who omitted what and who refused to look into what, and I am inclined to think, despite your well-conceived caution, that when I read it I'll be more specific and name names.

There are separate CIA Buckley and CIA Szulc chapters. They were important in all this, Szulc more than I'd realized before putting it together. This is the kind of thing I anticipated in deciding against a firm outline. From this I went to Hunt/Mullen. I'll be picking up again on all but Szulc where it fits.

In short, I have centered on this CIA aspect and where it spiders as the backbone. It will include the evidence of criminality toward the end. Also on occasion if it seems necessary in the telling. And I've begun all this part, which means after the opening I described earlier, but putting together the earlier Nixon/Hunt/Cushman/Walters relations around the Bay of Pigs. And I still have in mind the possibility or probability of the epilogue I mentioned earlier. So, what I am really asking your judgement on this: do you think that with this subject limitation I can do what I intend acceptably and meaningfully?